

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 78-80 are pending in the present application. No claims were canceled; claims 78-80 were amended; and no claims were added. The listing of the claims beginning on page 2 of this response replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.

Support for the amendments is found in the specification and drawings as follows: figure 1, 106; [0010], line 1; [0043], and lines 3-8 and 13-16.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview, Response to Final, and Advisory Action

A. Examiner Interview February 24, 2010

On February 24, 2010, a telephonic interview was conducted with Examiner Colbert to discuss the 35 U.S.C. § 101, 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections made in the Final Office Action of November 25, 2009 in light of proposed amendments. The following agreements were reached. The proposed amendments overcame the 35 U.S.C. § 101 and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections, Applicants understood that further amendments discussed with the Examiner would overcome the rejections. Applicants made such amendments. In addition, Applicants further amended to address a new objection to claim 79 made by the Examiner in the interview in which the Examiner objected to the number of wherein clauses.

B. Response to Final

On February 25, 2010, a Response to the Final Office action was made in accordance with the Examiner Interview.

C. Advisory Action

On March 15, 2010, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action stating that the proposed amendments would not be entered (paragraph 3) and referring to the Continuation sheet. In addition the Examiner stated that the reply had overcome the rejections indicated on another portion of the Continuation sheet. Specifically, the Examiner stated:

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants' amendments have overcome all of the 35 USC 112, Second Rejections in the amendments except being able to determine when a unit of work's status changes to a closed state and what is meant by using the same schema, It is unclear what same schema is being referenced. Also, the

following other defects are noted after a further and closer review of the claims. Claims 78 recites "saving, by the processor, ... , ... , ... , ... the record table is linked to the attribute table, and the record table is linked to the work unit table;" This claim limitation is redundant as written. The claim limitation would be better written as "saving, by the processor, ... , ... , ... , wherein the record table is linked to the attribute table and the unit of work table;". Claim 78 also recites "responsive to a flag in a required field of a record, changing, ... ". This would be better recited as "changing, responsive, to a flag in a required field of a record a status of the unit of work to a closed status ... ;". Claims 79 and 80 have a similar issue. Claim 80 has an "and" after "work" and before the "wherein" clause. The "and" should be deleted and a comma should be added before the "wherein" clause. Also the "and" after "services" and before "send" should be deleted. The last claim limitation on page 4, line 6 of that claim limitation of the amended claims should be changed from "changing" to "change to the closed status ... ". It is suggested that Applicants' add some dependent claims to the independent claims to give them better coverage of their invention .

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 101 Rejection, The 35 USC 112, Second paragraph rejections have been overcome in part ..

II. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claim 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Final Office Action dated November 25, 2009, pp. 2-3.

Pursuant to the Advisory Action, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner has objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention in claims 78-80. Additionally, the Examiner rejected the claims under the same reasons. Final Office Action dated November 25, 2009, p. 3.

In objecting to the specification, the Examiner states:

Claims 78-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 78 recites "agent", "computer service resource" and "processing engine" which are not found in the Specification. Claims 79 and 80 have a similar issue.

The specification references consuming “pay-per-use” of equipment under lease via a unit of measure (pg. 8) and only references equipment usage through out the specification without mentioning any specific equipment.”

Final Office Action dated November 25, 2009, p. 3.

Claims 78-80 have been amended to remove the terms “agent” and “processing engine.” Support for the amendments is found in figure 1, 106 and [0043], lines 13-16. Further, “computer service resource” has been amended to --computer resource--.

Therefore, the objection of the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph has been overcome.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. Final Office Action dated November 25, 2009, p. 3-5.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner made the following remarks (referring to the un-entered amendments):

Applicants’ amendments have overcome all of the 35 USC 112, Second Rejections in the amendments except being able to determine when a unit of work’s status changes to a closed state and what is meant by using the same schema, It is unclear what same schema is being referenced.

First, Applicants have deleted “same” from the claims and therefore no “same schema” is being referenced. Second, Applicants submit that the claims recite “changing, responsive to a flag in a required field of a record, a status of the unit of work to a closed status in the unit of work table, and responsive to changing the status of the unit of work to the closed status in the unit of work table, identifying a plurality of associated records, wherein an associated record is a record associated with the unit of work” and that this recitation is definite as to when a unit of works status changes, and that is when a required field of a record has a flag in it. Furthermore, the claim element conforms to the Examiner’s statement of allowable subject matter because the unit of work’s status is changed to a closed status in response to the flag in a required field of a record.

The Examiner further stated “[a]lso, the following other defects are noted after a further and closer review of the claims.”

First, the Examiner suggested a revision of the claim language.

Claims 78 recites "saving, by the processor, ... , ... , ... , ... the record table is linked to the attribute table, and the record table is linked to the work unit table;" This claim limitation is redundant as written. The claim limitation would be better written as "saving, by the processor, ... , ... , ... , wherein the record table is linked to the attribute table and the unit of work table;".

Applicants have amended claims 78-80 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

The Examiner further stated:

Claim 78 also recites "responsive to a flag in a required field of a record, changing, ... ". This would be better recited as "changing, responsive, to a flag in a required field of a record a status of the unit of work to a closed status ... ;". Claims 79 and 80 have a similar issue.

Applicants have amended claim 78-80 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

The Examiner further stated:

Claim 80 has an "and" after "work" and before the "wherein" clause. The "and" should be deleted and a comma should be added before the "wherein" clause.

Applicants believe that the Examiner intended to refer to claim 79 because that is where “and” appeared after “work” and before a “wherein” clause. Applicants have amended claim 79 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. The Examiner further stated:

Also the "and" after "services" and before "send" should be deleted.

Applicants have amended claims 80 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. The Examiner further stated:

The last claim limitation on page 4, line 6 of that claim limitation of the amended claims should be changed from "changing" to "change to the closed status ... ".

Applicants have amended claim 80 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. The Examiner further stated:

It is suggested that Applicants' add some dependent claims to the independent claims to give them better coverage of their invention.

Applicants respectfully decline to add dependent claims at this time, and request the Examiner to allow the pending claims in accordance with the Statement of Allowance and the Advisory Action.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has rejected claims 78-80 under the cited statutes but has stated claims 78-80 would be allowed if the rejections as given above were overcome. Final Office Action dated November 25, 2009, p. 5-6.

The Examiner states:

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: a flag in a required field of a record changing [by a processing engine] a status of a [particular] unit of work to a closed status in the unit of work table and responsive to changing the status of the [particular] unit of work to the closed status in the unit of work table, identifying [by the processing engine] a plurality of associated records, wherein an associated record is a record associated with a unit of work.

Final Office Action dated November 25, 2009, p. 5-6.

Applicants have amended the claims to conform to the Examiner's statement of allowable subject matter. Applicants submit that the scope of the claim has not been changed.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 78-80 under the cited statutes has been overcome.

VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: March 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Reg. No. 37,720
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants